

## REMARKS

Reconsideration is respectfully requested for claims 1, 3-8 and 10-14, said claims having been variously rejected as follows.

Claims 1, 3-8 and 10-14 have been provisionally rejected on the ground of non-statutory obviousness - type double patenting, as being unpatentable under claims 1-16 of co-pending application number 10/689,913. That application issued as U.S. Patent Number 7,159,619 on January 9, 2007. A Terminal Disclaimer is enclosed which is believed to remove the rejection based upon double patenting.

Claims 1, 3-8 and 10-14 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 based upon various combinations of Hawkins, III (5,706,894); Williams, et al. (2,628,134) and Stevenson (2,175,414). In view of the present amendment, claims 1, 3-8 and 10-14 are believed to distinguish over those three references, taken alone or in combination, and these claims are believed to be in prima facie condition for purpose of allowance. Each of the claims now calls for the side wall such as the sidewall 66, in Fig. 6, to have a lesser diameter than the load ring 64, also shown in Fig. 6. This difference in diameter is believed to be a very important part of the invention because it allows the plastic ring 130, illustrated in Fig. 21a, to be mounted on the cylindrical ring and yet have the same overall diameter as the diameter of the load lift ring 60. This feature is not found in any of the three references.

Claims 1, 3-8 and 10-14 are believed to be in prima facie condition for allowance.

Undersigned counsel for the applicants would welcome a telephone conference with the examiner should the examiner be of the opinion that such conference would advance the prosecution of this application.

Respectfully submitted,

10/19/07  
Date

  
William E. Johnson, Jr.  
Reg. No.: 22,719  
THE MATTHEWS FIRM (Customer No. 021897)  
2000 Bering Drive, Suite 700  
Houston, Texas 77057  
713-355-4200 Telephone  
713-355-9689 Facsimile